

REMARKS:

Claims 88 and 90, which have been objected to, are hereby canceled.

Claims 2, 5-9, 13, 14, 17, 20, 22, 25-30, 32-34, 54, 56, 71, 72, 75-77, and 88-104 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. In response, Applicant respectfully contends that the uncanceled ones of these claims (claims 2, 9, 75, 76, 103, and 104) as amended satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112 for the following reasons.

Claim 2 is to a repeater including “first circuitry” (configured as recited) and “second circuitry” coupled to the first circuitry and configured as recited. The repeater is configured for use in a communication system (said system including a transmitter, an external agent, at least one transition minimized differential signaling-like link, a second TMDS-like link, and a receiver). It is not intended that elements of the system other than the repeater itself (including the recited elements of the repeater) are elements of the claim.

Claim 75 is to a receiver including “circuitry” (configured as recited). The receiver is configured for use in a communication system (said system including a transmitter, a TMDS-like link, and a communication channel). It is not intended that elements of the system other than the receiver itself (including the recited elements of the receiver) are elements of the claim.

In the system in which the receiver of claim 75 is configured for use, a transmitter is configured to implement a content protection protocol which includes a procedure for supplying a receiver key to the receiver. Applicant acknowledges (as stated by the Examiner with reference to claim 99) that claim 75 does not disclose the details of this procedure, but contends that this is proper and that it is not intended that the procedure be of any specific type.

Applicant also contends that claim 75 has the antecedent basis (for “the pseudo-random value”) that the Examiner contends was lacking in claim 99. The antecedent basis is recited in line 21 of claim 75 (“wherein the transmitter is configured to generate a pseudo-random value”).

Claim 103 is to a transmitter including “circuitry” (configured as recited). The transmitter is configured for use in a communication system (said system including a receiver, a TMDS-like link, and a communication channel). It is not intended that elements of the system other than the transmitter itself (including the recited elements of the transmitter) are elements of the claim. The transmitter is configured to implement a content protection protocol which includes a procedure for supplying a receiver key to a receiver. Applicant acknowledges (as stated by the Examiner with reference to claim 100) that claim 103 does not disclose the details of this procedure, but contends that this is proper and that it is not intended that the procedure be of any specific type.

Claims 79-84 and 99-102 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by pages 400-402 of the book by Menezes, et al., entitled Handbook of Applied Cryptography (“Menezes”), and claims 71, 72, and 85 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Menezes. In response, these claims are canceled.

Claims 77 and 86-87 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Menezes in view of pages 101, 113, 131-134, 140-141, 386-387, 389, and 406 of the book by Pfleeger entitled Security in Computing (“Pfleeger”). In response, these claims are canceled.

Claims 13, 14, 17, 20, 22, 25-26, 32-34, 54, 56, and 89-98 stand finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pfleeger. In response, these claims are canceled.

Finally rejected claims 5-8, 27-30, and 88 are also canceled.

Applicant respectfully contends that the uncanceled claims (as amended) are in

condition for allowance, and requests allowance of these claims.

Respectfully submitted,

GIRARD & EQUITZ LLP

Dated: 3/14/07

By: Alfred A. Equitz

Alfred A. Equitz  
Reg. No. 30,922

Attorneys for Applicant

Attorney Docket No. SII-800 [SIMG0103]